(c) Kumki lands are not reserved nor grazing grounds ordinarily. The wishes of the villagers and the extent available for grazing are taken into consideration before any grazing grounds are reserved for assignment to members of the depressed classes.

Withdrawal of jamabandi allowances payable to village officers and village menials.

* 213 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have recently issued orders completely stopping the jamabandi allowances given till now to village officers and menials;

(b) when these allowances were introduced by the Government and for what reasons or objects;

(c) what the reasons are that have prompted the Government to withdraw these allowances all on a sudden; and

(d) whether the Government contemplate restoring these allowances in the near future?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) & (c) In 1920, the Government accepted the recommendation of the Salaries Committee that village officers and servants should be given certain fixed sums towards their expenses for attending jamabandi. In 1926, the payment of the sums to village officers was discontinued in order to find money to meet the cost of giving effect to the Village Officers Restoration Act. The village menials however continued to draw the allowance at Rs. 2-8-0 per head. In 1931, the Government accepted the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee that the amount paid to menials should be reduced to Rs. 2.

(d) The answer is in the negative.

Public Service

Alteration of the rule regarding recruitment of S.S.L.C. holders to Public Service.

* 214 Q.—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that candidates who had secured eligibility in the S.S.L.C. Public Examinations were originally declared eligible for public service and were allowed to sit for the Public Services Commission examinations;

[31st October 1933

(b) whether the Government later altered the qualifications of candidates by prescribing a minimum of 35 per cent marks in each of the specified subjects for the S.S.L.C. Examinations;

(c) whether it is a fact that several candidates who sat for and succeeded in the Public Services Commission Examination are now disqualified under the new rules; and

(d) whether the Government will consider the cases of the candidates who passed in the Public Services Commission Examinations prior to the alteration of the rules and permit their entertainment in Government service?

A.—(*a*) Yes, on the assumption that the hon. Member is referring to the competitive examination held by the Madras Services Commission for clerkships and to eligibility for admission to the University courses of study.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) Government have already passed a rule protecting the candidates referred to by the hon. Member.

Administration of Justice

Confirmation of District Munsifs.

* 215 *Q.*—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the High Court has sent up proposals for the confirmation of district munsifs who are acting;

(*b*) if so, what the nature, scope and effect of the proposals are and when the proposals were received by the Government;

(*c*) what action the Government have taken on the recommendations of the High Court and whether any orders have been passed; and

(*d*) if so, whether a copy of the orders will be placed on the table of the House and, if not, what the reason is for the delay?

A.—(*a*), (*b*), (*c*) & (*d*) Appointments and confirmations of District Munsifs are made by the High Court. In 1931 the High Court brought to the notice of the Government that the Accountant-General objected to the suspension of lien of certain officiating Sub-Judges and the provisional confirmation of acting District Munsifs in consequence ordered by the High Court, on the ground that they were inadmissible under the audit instruction under Fundamental Rule 13. The hon. Member presumably refers to this. If so, the question was carefully considered by Government in consultation with the High Court and the Accountant-General and orders have been passed in G.O. No. 2966, Law (General), dated 5th September 1933, a copy of which is laid on the table.[a]

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on pages 249–250 infra.